Mysore 401-14 (1,2,7-8)
" 1929-(1-2)
App. F. IX-4
" 20-31 (1-2)

Previous References
Mysore 89-30 (1-6)
" 740-08 (1-2)
87.36-18-14
" 21-17-1

Later References
Mes 165-34-1 Etc.

1932
(Home)

File No. 76-32

Serial Nos. 1-8

PRESERVED

Present
(35)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. ~~Eight~~ 1-8

Part B for June 1933

SUBJECT.

Notice from Mr. Vasudeva Rao, Advocate on behalf of Mrs Annapurnamma threatening a suit for declaration of her right to a house in 4th Avenue Wood Bangalore city.

Nop 6030 B/9-5-33

To Mr Vasudevarao, Advocate.

Inform him that Govt do not intend disturbing possession of the property during the lifetime of Mrs Annapurnamma.

M Iyengar
12/7/33

G. R. S. APP. F. III—1] 1932

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Law)

NOTES.

File No. 76-32.

FILE HEADING.

Notice under Sec 80 C.P.C.

FROM Mr. D. Vasudeva Rao, Advocate, B'lore

No.	Dated 25.11.32	Received 6.12.32
Diary No. 3138	Enclos. Spare copies	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Issues notice on behalf Annapurnamma, widow of late Pt. Venkatesa Iyer threatening a suit for declaration of her right to the house in Avenue road known as "Book Depot" which is said to have been given away as a gift to augment the Charities of Ramanuja by her adopted son one P. Chandrasekharaiah.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) Subt with a dft calling for a report from the Hy. Com

ISD 7/12

Issue
6/12/32

TYPE SECTION
8. DEC. 1932
GENL. & REV. SECTT.

Sup A 10/12/32

Issued no. P. 3209 dated 9th Dec 1932

NOTES—First Sheet

WD 69—GBPM—5,000—14-7-31

Law File No. 76 of 1932. | General and Revenue Secretariat

From,

The Mag. Cent.

No 670/32.33 dated 16th March 1933

forwarding the necessary records Connected with the notice.

1) A notice is issued under sec 80 C.P.C. by Mr. D. Vasudeva Rao, Adv. B'lore on behalf of Mrs. Annapoorneamma threatening suit for declaration of the right to a house in the Avenue Road, which is said to have been given away as a gift to augment the charities of Polepalli Ramantha. by her adopted Son one P. Chandra sekharaiah.

2) It is Contended in the notice that the said property was given to her absolutely in pursuance of an award in this 126/1878 in the file of the Dist. Judge, B'lore, and that the adopted Son has no right to alienate it by way of gift or otherwise.

3) In this Connection it may be recalled that one Mr. Polepalli Ramantha garu endowment of a Sum of Rs 50,000/- was certain Conditions for the purpose of Chatram and temple built by him in Siddakatte. The petitioner is the daughter-in-law of the donor and Mr. Chandrasekharaiah is her adopted Son. Few years back the properties of the donor devolved upon Mrs. Chandrasekharaiah, as legal heir

Serial No.

and Consequently has lease he was entrusted with the management and of the Chattram and the Temple. With a view to increase the Endowment given by his grandfather upto Rs 25,000 he prays for certain Concessions which are Complied and Recently he Conveyed by way of gift a house situated in the Avenue Road worth about Rs 5000/- in order to augument the Charities of his grandfather; and has agreed to pay a monthly rent of Rs 25/- for some time to Come.

Now the dispute has arisen about the ownership of the house. In the Statements given before the Builder Mr. Chandrasekharasetty says that his adoptive mother who is in possession of the house which was given in pursuance of the award in O.S. 116/1916, has got only a limited interest in the property, and that She Can enjoy the possession of the same tote her death. Mrs. Annapurnamma Contends that the said house along with other properties were given to her as a result of some dispute which arose after Chandrasekharasetty attained majority, and that he has no right to alienate the house. The Copy of the award is not available. Though there is some force in the Contentions raised by Mr. Chandrasekharasetty the question requires further Examination with reference to the award filed in O.S. 116/1916. The same may be called for reference and return. Meanwhile so long

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

938 Sows

4

Low File No. 76 of 1932. | General and Revenue Secretariat

a) She is allowed to live in the house peacefully there is no reason why she should agitate for the declaration of her rights, knowing however that her interest is only limited.

b) Notice also claims for the return of the title deeds and one document relating to the house. This is answered in para 5 of the D.C.'s letter dated 4th March '33.

Submitted for orders.

ISD
22/5

7) Polepalli Chamrasekhara Sethi has executed on 22-6-29 a gift deed in favour of the Mer Com^r transferring to him absolutely the house No.: 25 in Avenue Road, Bangalore City. The Mer Com^r has in turn granted a lease of the premises to the donor himself for a term of 15 years on a monthly rental of Rs 25/-. All these transactions have been entered into on the supposition that the donor was the absolute owner of the house and also in possession of the same.

8) The notice given by Bama parvamma the adoptive mother of the donor Chamrasekhara Sethi as well as the reports now received show that the donor is not in possession of the property and that it has been given to his mother for her enjoyment during

Serial No.

and Consequently [illegible] he was entrusted with the management of the Chattiram and the Temple. With a view to increase the endowment given by his grandfather upto Rs. 25,000 he prayed for certain Concessions which were Complied with. Recently he Conveyed by way of gift a house situated in the Avenue Road worth about Rs. 50,000/- in order to augument the Charities of his grandfather, and has agreed to pay a monthly rent of Rs. 25/- for some time to Come.

Now the dispute has arisen about the ownership of the house. In the Statements given before the Arbitrator, Mr. Chandrasekharaselly says that his adoptive mother who is in possession of the house which was given in pursuance of the award in M.S. No. 116/1926, has got only a limited interest in the property, and that She Can enjoy the possession of the same till her death. Mrs. Annapurnamma Contends that the said house along with other properties were given to her as a result of some dispute which arose after Chandrasekharaselly attained majority, and that he has no right to alienate the house. The Copy of the award is not available. Though there is some force in the Contentions raised by Mr. Chandrasekharaselly, the question requires further Examination with reference to the award filed in M.S. 116/1926. The same may be Called for reference and return. Meanwhile so long

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0246 —GPB—15,000—22-8-32

5581 7

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 76 of 1932 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

U.O.No 53/32
dt 26-4-33.

Forwarded with compliments to the Govt Advocate for favour of advice.

M.P.S.Rao
for Chief Secretary
28/4/33



No. Dev 987/32-33
dt 5.4.33

No. Dev 158/32-33
dt 15.5.33

Returned with compliments.

It is clear that Mr. Chandrasekhara Setty's statement in the Gift Deed that he was in possession and that he put the donee in possession of the property is not correct. He now explains in his statement before the Amildar that the possession is with his adoptive mother and that on this account he has executed a lease deed undertaking to pay Rs.25/- a month expecting perhaps - that before the expiry of the term fixed in the lease he would become the full owner.

The main points urged in the notice are that the Title deeds should be returned and that her possession should not be disturbed.

The adoptive mother is only entitled to be in possession of the property during her life time and she cannot claim to be the absolute owner of the property. She is not therefore entitled to the return of the Title Deeds given over to the Muzrai Commissioner by Mr.Chandrasekhara Setty.

As she is entitled to continue in possession of the property during her life time, the Lessee or the donee cannot disturb her possession and Government are not now seeking to do it.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0216—GPB—15,000—22-8-32

If these

If these points are made clear to the party she will I think be satisfied. A reply may therefore be given to Mr. D.Vasudeva Rao on the above lines.

As Mr. Chandrasekhara Setty's present undertaking to pay Rs.25/- a month is not satisfactory and as it may be difficult to enforce the payment if he fails to pay the same, he may I think be called upon to give over for the charities some other property of equal value.

Government Advocate.
15-5-1933.

CSN.

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
16 MAY 1933
No.

Draft Reply to the notice
DRP
15/5/33

2 Dfts are subs for appl.
The two drafts put up may be approved.
Gen Secy)

DRP
16/5

I Member

17/5

DRP
17/5

16/5/33
18/5

18/5

Issue
DRP
18/5

OFFICE
FILE
17 MAY 1933
No. 9593

TYPING OFFICE
16.
GENERAL

1 119 Tree 9

General and Revenue Secretariat | Land File No. 76 of 193 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

To,

The Mag. Comm.

No. P. 6029 dated 19.5.33 informing that Mr. Chandrasekhara Setty's present undertaking to pay Rs. 25/- per month is not satisfactory and requesting to call upon him to give over for the Charities some other property of equal value

Mr. D. Nandeva Rao. Advocate

no. P 6030 d 19.5.33 informing that Govt do not intend disturbing possession of the property during the lifetime of Mrs. Annapoorna and that neither is no Cause of action against Govt in the matter

To,

Mag. Br. for perusal and return. with Compliments

ISD 22/5/33

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT 1296 23 MAY 1933 MUZRAI

Submitted for perusal

Received 23/5/33

23/5/33

1/6/33.

1/6

Block & Branch mkt Cmtes.

1/6/33

File 1/6/33

2/6/33

NOTE—Contd. Sheet.

WD 0246 —GPB—15,000—22-8-32

D. Vasudeva Rao, B.A., B.L.,
ADVOCATE, MYSORE HIGH COURT,
CHICKPET, BANGALORE CITY.

3138/P832
10

Bangalore,
25th November 32.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore, BANGALORE.

CHIEF SECRETARY
3 DEC. 1932

Sir,

Under instructions from my client Annapurnamma, widow of Polepalli Visvamurthy, I have to inform you which I hereby do as follows:--

(1) That one P.Chandra Sekhra setty is the adopted son of my client.

(2) That after the death of my client's husband, disputes arose between her and her adopted son re: the properties and they were settled by Panchayetdars under an award dated 22nd May 1926 and the award was filed in Mis.126 of 25-26, on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore, the petitioner being Mr. B.V.Srinivasa Iyer, Secretary to Arbitration and the opponents being my client and Chandra Sekhara Setty by a petition under Section 11 of Mysore Arbitration Regulation. The award has been signed by arbitrators and also by my client and Chandra Sekhara Setty.

(3) That the award is inforce from that date

(4) That as stated in the award a house in the Avenue Road generally known as "Book Depot" was given possession of to my client for residence, her step son having no right on it.

(5) That a sum of Rs.500 was also given to my client by the award for the repairs of that house.

(6) That my client very recently learnt that her step

son has on 22nd April 1929 executed a document in favour of Government by Muzrai Commissioner conveying the above house by way of gift to augment the charities of Polepalli Narasimha chetty and Narinswami Chetty as per conditions mentioned in that deed. Wherein he has mentioned inter alia that he is absolutely seized of the house and is in possession of it. She applied for a copy of the registered bond to Sub Registrar's office, Bangalore on 27th October 1932 and it was delivered to her on 2-11-1932. Registered as No.2526, Book I, Vol.170, pages 322-333.

(7) My client respectfully submits that Chandrasekhara Setty has without any right conveyed to the Government by way of gift the house set apart for her residence and has also as stated in the indenture in favour of Government, delivered to Government title deeds pertaining thereto.

(8) Since Chandra Sekhara Setty has no right over the house during the life time of my client, my client submits he has no right to convey it by way of gift &c., to Government or to any other person and as such the Government derive no title under the deed of gift in its favour by Chandra Sekhara Setty. That document is void and is of no effect in law and my client is not bound by it.

(9) That my client is in possession of the house.

(10) This is therefore to inform the Government that they are not entitled to get the house for the charities of Polepalli Narasimha Setty or for any other purpose and to request that the Government by Muzrai Commissioner may be pleased to return the title deeds to my client re: the house. The Government are not entitled to take possession of the house also.

(11) My client further hereby informs the Government that if the title deeds and other documents re: to the house are not returned to her within two months from the date of receipt of this letter by the Government, I have instructions to file a suit against Government for the return of the same and for other reliefs. In that case the Government will be made liable to pay to my client her costs and be responsible for the consequences. The charges of this Registered notice is payable by Government to my office.

I remain,
Sir,
Your most respectfully,

D Vasudeva Rao
Advocate.

SCHEDULE.

House bearing Municipal No.28, North Sivacharada Nanjunda Sastry's house, South Chandrasekhara Setty Gadi Khane, East Avenue Road, West Devanga Bangalore Krishnathanavara Nanjundappa's house.

D. Vasudeva Rao
Advocate.

No P 3209 (Enc)
Law 76-32-2

13

8th December 1932.

-9

The

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

I am directed to forward herewith copy of the notice issued under Section 80 C.P.C. by Mr.D.Vasudeva Rao, Advocate, Bangalore, on behalf of Annapurnamma, widow of Polepalli ~~Kxxxhxxxxxxxx~~ Visvamurthy, threatening a suit for declaration of her right to a house in the Avenue Road known as "Book Depot" which is said to have been given away as gift to augment the Charities of Polepalli Narasimha Setty, by her adopted son one P.Chandrasekhara Setty, and to request that a report together with the connected records may kindly be sent for orders of Government early.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

S.R.2/Enc.1

for General Secretary to Government.

Appendix F G—1]

114

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Law

File No. 76-32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. P 3209/Ecn/

To The Muz. Commr

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith Copy of the notice issued under Sec 80 C.P.C., by Mr. D. Vasudeva Rao, Advocate, B'lore on behalf of Annapurnamma widow of Polepalli Vishwanathy, threatening a Suit for declaration of the right to a house in the Avenue Road known as "Book Depot" which is said to have been given away as gift to augment the Charities of Polepalli Narasimhareddy, by his adopted Son one P. Chandrasekhareddy, and to request that a report together with the connected records may kindly be sent for orders at your early.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 9/12/32

Signed by

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7-31.

ISD

I have see

Ce

for Gen! Sec?

No. 620/32-33
Ewe 4 files

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 14th 193 7
16.

5023/32 52

Laws 76-32-3

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General ..... *Department.*

GENERAL SECRETARY
17 MAR 1933

SIR, No Laws

17.3.

With reference to your letter No. Laws 76-3-2 -- dated 7/.th [illegible] regarding the report [illegible] the office issued by Mr. D. Vasudeva [illegible], due to ill health of Mr. [illegible], [illegible] time [illegible] on account of his house property in Avenue Road, Bangalore City, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No.3-3696 76 dated 4th March 1933 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, submitting a report in the matter.

2. The notes and orders contained in this office collections will explain the facts of the case in sufficient

-6676/2-33 dt. 4th [illegible]
District to the Collector [illegible]

---

1) Referring to your letter No.620/7,-33 dated 17-12-1933 [illegible] report on petition issued by Mr. M. Vasu[illegible] Annamma, widow of late Alli Visu Mudali to the Government regarding grant of a house by Mr. Lole Alli Chandrasekharappa Setti to enable the resources of Alamelu [illegible] to the [illegible] I have the honour to enclose herewith the statement of Annamma Vasu and Mr. Lole Alli Chandrasekharappa Setti recorded at the Collectorate Cuddapah on 10-1-33.

2) The contention of Annamma is that Chandrasekharappa Setti the donor, is not the master of the document which he wants to cancel - his life interest and has no right to alienate it and that the document is not entitled to be [illegible] as charitable. In reply to this contention Mr. Chandrasekharappa Setti states that Annamma has only a life interest in the property without the power of alienation and that he, as reversioner, has every right to alienate the property without disturbing Annamma's possession during her life time.

It

No.P 5157
Law 76-32-4

24th March 1933
25

The

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore;
Bangalore.

With reference to your letter No.620/32-33 dated 16th March 1933 forwarding connected records relating to the notice issued on behalf of Mrs.Annapurnamma widow of late Polepalli Vishvamurthy, I am directed to request that a copy of the award said to have been filed in Mis.126/25-26 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore, as pointed out in para 2 of the notice may kindly be obtained from Polepalli Chendrasekhara Setti and sent immediately for reference and return.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

S.R.-2

2 days

20

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

1

Section Law

File No. 76-32

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. P 5157

To. The Hon. Mny. Commr.

Sir,

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

With reference to your letter no. 620/1933 dated 16th March 1933 forwarding Connected records relating to the notice issued on behalf of Mrs. Annapurnamma widow of late Polepalli Venkanna Thy. I am directed to request that a ~~certified~~ Copy of the award said to have been filed in Mis 126/1926 on the file of the Dist. Judge B'Lore, as pointed out in para 2 of the notice may kindly be obtained from Polepallichennakeshavareddi and sent immediately for reference and return.

I have etc

Date of issue 25/3/1933

Signed by Hn. V. N. J. Rao

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

ISD 28/3.

M/s 28/3 Genl Secl

No.P.5758
Revenue 76-32-S

24th March 1933.

To

D.Vasudeva Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Bangalore.

With reference to his notice dated 25th November 1932, issued under Section 80 C.P.C. on behalf of Mrs.Annapurnamma, widow of Polepalli Vishvamurthy in the matter of a house situated in the Avenue Road, Bangalore City, Mr.D.Vasudeva Rao is/informed that the matter is under consideration of Govennment.

By Order,

Jr General Secretary to Government.

S.R.-2

Appendix F G—1]

22--

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

11

Section Law

File No. 76-32

Serial No. 5

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... End: No. P.5758/—

To D. Vasudeva Rao Esq B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, B'lore

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 25/3/33

Signed by Sri N. R. J. Rao

With reference to his notice dated 25th June 1932, issued under sec 80 C.P.C. on behalf of Mrs. Annapurnamma widow of Polepalli Kshvamurthy in the matter of a house bounded in the Avenue Road, B'lore city, Mr. D. Vasudeva Rao, Advocate is hereby informed that the matter is under Consideration of Govt.

B.O.
IM/22/3
for Secy [illegible]

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

SD 23/3

No. 620 Exe Dues
32-33

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore,...20th April.... 1933
21.

558/9/32
Law 76-32-6

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General .....*Department.*

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
21 APR. 1933
No. Law

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.P.5157/Law 76-32-4 dated 24/25th March 1933 re the threatened suit by Mrs.Annapurnamma for a declaration of her right to a house in Avenue Road, Bangalore City I have the honour to forward herewith -- a copy of the award filed in Mis.126/25-26 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore, by Mrs. Annapurnamma and Mr.Polepalli Chendrasekhara Setty.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

In the Court of the District Judge.
Bangalore District.

Dated this 14th day of June 1926.

Present: P. Srinivasa Aiyar Esqr.
B.A. B.L.
District Judge.

Misc No 126 of 1925-1926.

Petitioner. B. V. Srinivasa Aiyar

Opponents. (1). Polepalli Chandra Sekhara Sastry
(2) Annapurnamma.

Under Section 17 of the Mysore Arbitration Regulation the petitioner who is said to be the Secretary to the Arbitration Committee with the Estate belonging to the opponents prays that the award dated 22.5.1926 produced by him may be ordered to be filed in Court and as there appear to be no objections must have signed this application.

14.6.1926. Petitioner Absent.
For opponent by Mr Nagappa
The award may be filed

(Sd) P. S.
14.6.26 District Judge

Date of order 10-0-0. Date of delivery

Civil Revision Petition (C.R.P.) No. of

Suit No. 126 of 1925-1926.

P. V. Sreenivasa Iyer ... Petitioner

— V/s —

(1) Annapurnamma
(2) P. Chandrasekhara } Opposite parties

Petition

ఈ కేసు 1926 మార్చి నెలలో ఈ కోర్టులో విచారణకు వచ్చినప్పుడు ఈ కింది ఆర్డరు చేయబడింది:—

ఈ కేసు 1926 మార్చి 11 వ తేదీన పి. వి. శ్రీనివాస అయ్యర్ తరపున వకీలు శ్రీ ఎ. వి. కృష్ణస్వామి అయ్యర్ గారు మరియు ప్రతివాదుల తరపున వకీలు శ్రీ పి. చంద్రశేఖర రావు గారు హాజరయ్యారు. ఈ కేసు 1925 సంవత్సరంలో ఈ కోర్టులో దాఖలు చేయబడింది. ఈ కేసులో వాదులు ప్రతివాదులపై ఒక దావా వేశారు. ఈ దావాలో వాదులు ప్రతివాదులు తమ ఆస్తిని అన్యాయంగా ఆక్రమించుకున్నారని ఆరోపించారు. ఈ ఆస్తి వివాదాస్పదమైనది. ఈ కేసులో ఇరుపక్షాల వాదనలు విన్న తర్వాత, ఈ కోర్టు ఈ కింది తీర్పును ఇస్తోంది.

ఈ కేసులో వాదులు తమ ఆస్తిని ప్రతివాదులు అన్యాయంగా ఆక్రమించుకున్నారని ఆరోపించారు. ఈ ఆస్తి వివాదాస్పదమైనది. ఈ కేసులో ఇరుపక్షాల వాదనలు విన్న తర్వాత, ఈ కోర్టు ఈ కింది తీర్పును ఇస్తోంది. ఈ కేసులో వాదులు తమ ఆస్తిని ప్రతివాదులు అన్యాయంగా ఆక్రమించుకున్నారని ఆరోపించారు. ఈ ఆస్తి వివాదాస్పదమైనది. ఈ కేసులో ఇరుపక్షాల వాదనలు విన్న తర్వాత, ఈ కోర్టు ఈ కింది తీర్పును ఇస్తోంది.

(2) ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಯ ಸಹಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಯ ಸಹಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದ

(ب) ہر ایسا شخص جو اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کا مرتکب ہو، اس کی سزا قید جو تین سال تک ہو سکتی ہے، اور جرمانہ بھی ہو گا۔

(ج) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کسی ایسے افسر کی اجازت کے بغیر نہیں کی جائیں گی جو اس کام کے لیے اس سے اعلیٰ درجے کا ہو جو اس کام کے لیے عام یا خاص طور پر مجاز کیا گیا ہو۔

(د) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ہ) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(و) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ز) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ح) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ط) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ی) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ک) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(گ) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ل) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(م) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ن) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(و) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ہ) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(د) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کرنے والا افسر کسی ایسے شخص کو جو اس جرم کا مرتکب ہوا ہو، گرفتار کر سکتا ہے اور اس کے قبضے سے کوئی ایسا مال یا چیز ضبط کر سکتا ہے جو اس جرم کے ارتکاب میں استعمال ہوئی ہو۔

(ج) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کسی ایسے افسر کی اجازت کے بغیر نہیں کی جائیں گی جو اس کام کے لیے اس سے اعلیٰ درجے کا ہو جو اس کام کے لیے عام یا خاص طور پر مجاز کیا گیا ہو۔

(ب) ہر ایسا شخص جو اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کا مرتکب ہو، اس کی سزا قید جو تین سال تک ہو سکتی ہے، اور جرمانہ بھی ہو گا۔

(ا) اس دفعہ کے تحت کسی جرم کی تحقیقات کسی ایسے افسر کی اجازت کے بغیر نہیں کی جائیں گی جو اس کام کے لیے اس سے اعلیٰ درجے کا ہو جو اس کام کے لیے عام یا خاص طور پر مجاز کیا گیا ہو۔

(6) ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಈ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅದರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಎಸಗಿದಾಗ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಅಪರಾಧಿಯೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲ್ಪಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

(7) ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಈ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅದರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಎಸಗಿದಾಗ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಅಪರಾಧಿಯೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲ್ಪಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

(8) ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಈ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅದರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಎಸಗಿದಾಗ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಅಪರಾಧಿಯೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲ್ಪಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

(9) ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಈ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅದರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಎಸಗಿದಾಗ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಅಪರಾಧಿಯೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲ್ಪಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

(10) ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಈ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅದರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಎಸಗಿದಾಗ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಉಸ್ತುವಾರಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಅಪರಾಧಿಯೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲ್ಪಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

(Sd.) P. Chandrasekhara Sastry.

(1) (Sd.) [illegible]

(2) " [illegible]

(3) " [illegible]

(4) " [illegible]

(5) " [illegible]

(6) " Bhuvaneswara Sastry.

(7) " P. [illegible]

(8) [illegible]

(1)(Sd.) M. V. Narasimha Sastry.

(2) " C. G. Krishnaiah Sastry.

(Sd.) K. V. Subramanyam.

No. 565 [illegible]

[illegible]

(Sd.) P. Chandrasekhara.

"True Copy"

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by .....

1

Section Law

File No. 76-32

Serial No. 7

No. 7. C 029/Gen 4 Arbs & Recon

To The Hon. Comm.

Sir,

With reference to the Correspondence ending with Your letter no. 620/32-33 dated 21st April 1933 re: the notice issued on behalf of Mrs. Annapurnamma in the matter of a house situated in the Avenue Road Bangalore City, I am directed to enclose herewith a Copy of the reply ~~to the~~ sent to the notice, and to state that the Chandrasekhara Setty's present undertaking to pay Rs 25/- per month is not satisfactory as it may be difficult

to enforce the payment if he fails to pay the same.

I am ~~therefore~~ to request you therefore to call upon Mr. Chandrasekharaiah to give me for the Charities Same other property of equal value

The entire records received ~~with~~ in this Connection are herewith returned.

I have the

PM
16/5 for Gen Secy

ISD
16/5

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. P 6025 — Encl. to Memo Dated, Bangalore, 18th May 1933.

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.620/32-33 dated 21st April 1933 regarding the notice issued on behalf of Mrs. Annapurnamma in the matter of a house situated in the Avenue Road, Bangalore City, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the reply sent to the notice and to state that Mr. Chandrasekhara Setty's present undertaking to pay Rs.25/- per month is not satisfactory as it may be difficult to enforce the payment if he fails to pay the same. I am to request you therefore to call upon Mr. Chandrasekhara Setty to give over for the charities some other property of equal value.

The entire records received in this connection are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

MG.2.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 9/5/33

Signed by .....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by 10/5/1933

Examined by.....

11

Section Law

File No. 76-32

Serial No. 8

No. P-5758

To

D. Vandeva Rao, Esq. B.A., B.L.,

Advocate, B'Lore.

Sir,

In Continuation of this office ~~Endt~~ no. P. 5758 dated 25th March 1933 re: the notice issued on behalf of Mrs. Annapurnamma widow of Polepally Venkanarthy in the matter of a house situated in the Avenue Road B'lore City, I am directed to state that Mrs. Annapurnamma ~~the adoptive mother~~ is only entitled to be in possession of the property during her life time and ~~she~~ Cannot claim ~~to be the~~ absolute ownership of the property. She is

not therefore entitled to the
return of the Title deeds further.
as to us. Myrai Commissioner
by Mr. Chandrashekharaselly.

I am also to add
that you ~~are not entitled~~ do not intend
disturbing her possession of the property
~~entitled to continue in possession~~
~~of the property~~ cancel during her lifetime, and as such there is
no cause of action
for your client to take
any legal proceedings
as you in the
matter

If she ~~is advised however to~~
to filing a suit against you, she
will be ~~held~~ liable for the
costs the incurred thereby.

I have etc
for Govt Secy

ISD
16/5.

BSM
16/5

16/5

35

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. P 5030-32 & Rev 76-32

Dated, Bangalore, 18th May 1933.

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

D. Vasudeva Rao, Esq.,
Advocate, Chickpet,
Bangalore City.

Sir,

In continuation of this office Endorsement No.P.5158 dated 25th March 1933 regarding the notice issued on behalf of Mrs. Annapurnamma widow of Polepally Vishvamurthy in the matter of a house situated in the Avenue Road, Bangalore City, I am directed to state that Mrs.Annapurnamma is only entitled to be in possession of the property during her life time and cannot claim absolute ownership of the property. She is not therefore entitled to the return of the Title deeds given over to the Muzrai Commissioner by Mr. Chandrasekhara Setty.

I am also to add that Government do not intend disturbing her possession of the property during her life time, and as such there is no cause of action for your client to take any legal proceedings against Government in the matter.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

FG.3.